

Project: **The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres**

Project acronym: Europub.com
Project website: <http://europub.wz-berlin.de>

Funded by: 5th Framework Programme of the European Commission
Contract No. HPSE-CT2000-00046
Work package: **WP 2 (Content coding of claim-making)**
WP Coordinator: Ruud Koopmans
Deliverable number: **D 2.3**

Report **Final case report of political claims analysis**

Case report **France**

Author: Virginie Guiraudon

Date: 27 April 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
PART II: Commented Tables	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
1. Article-level.....	3
2. Claim-level.....	7
General	7
Location.....	8
Actors (claim makers)	12
Action forms.....	24
Addressees.....	26
Issues and aims.....	34
Object actors.....	48
Frames	55
Abbreviations and definitions	58
References	59

Commented Tables

1. Article-level

Table 1.1: Number of articles coded per year

Year	Articles coded (in % within sample) from		Total	
	full sample issue	reduced European sample issue	In %	(N)
1990	15,1	5,8	10,8	249
1995	14,6	9,2	12,1	279
2000	36,5	33,4	35,1	807
2001	.	31,4	14,4	331
2002	33,8	20,1	27,5	633
Total (N)	100 1246	100 1053	100	2299

A total number of 2299 articles were coded in France for a reference period of five single years, stretching from 1990 to 2002. Around 46% of the articles were selected according to a reduced sample, which takes into account only articles with at least one European dimension (i.e. either about a European topic or involving a European actor). The number of articles in 1990 and 1995 is lower because the sample is reduced by half: instead of coding two quality papers in each week, only one is coded per week, in an alternating fashion. In 2001, only articles with a European dimension were coded.

Table 1.2: Articles by paper

Paper	Number of articles (N)	In % of database
Le Monde	1010	43,9
Le Figaro	1143	49,7
Ouest France	55	2,4
L'Humanité	91	4
Total	2299	100

The most important part of the database is constituted by articles from the two quality broadsheets with nation-wide distribution, the centre-right *Figaro* (about half) and the centre-left *Le Monde* (44%). An additional 6,4% stem from two other newspapers, the regional quality daily *Ouest France* published in Western France and the Communist daily *L'Humanité*. The latter is not a tabloid that could be compared to the German *Bild* or the British *Sun*. Yet, given the ideology of the French Communist Party, it could be presumed to have a view of the EU that takes more into account the concerns of less privileged classes than the broadsheets. The latter two papers were only coded for the year 2000, in order to allow comparative analysis with the two quality papers. In that year they together make up 18% of all articles (11,2% OF and 6,8% Huma).

Table 1.3: Section from which articles were coded by paper

Section	By paper, in %				Total	
	Monde	Figaro	OF	Huma	In %	(N)
Mixed internat'l/national news section	29,9	2,9	12,7	14,3	15,4	355
Regional/local news section	,2	,1	.	.	,1	3
Commentary pages	9,1	9,1	–	1,1	8,6	197
Business / economy section	13,7	41,4	32,7	11	27,8	639
International news section	23,6	29,8	34,5	56	28,2	649
National news section	14,2	16,7	20	17,6	15,7	361
No differentiation between sections	8	–	–	–	3,5	81
Section unknown	1,4	–	–	–	,6	14
Total (N)	100 1010	100 1143	100 55	100 91	100	2299

Like in the other national case studies, the selected papers were scanned for relevant articles in the news section, in the economic and business section. Only regular sections appearing on a daily basis were included. This means that sections on environment or science that appear once a week were disregarded, although they may have contained articles relevant to our policy sectors (such as science articles on BSE). A special page on agriculture in *Ouest France* was excluded.

Over one a quarter of articles stem from the business or economic section and slightly less than two thirds of all articles stemming from news sections. 8,6% are articles from opinion pages that are not written by the paper itself but by other authors (i.e. guest commentaries by politicians or intellectuals). In fact, only the broadsheets have commentary pages. The other newspapers feature them on the front page (OF) or towards the end (Humanité). The own commentaries and editorials of the four papers are analysed in a separate study (work package 3 of the Europub project).

An important difference between the two broadsheets needs to be underlined. *Le Figaro* has a large daily business section known as “les pages saumon” (salmon-colored pages). *Le Monde* has a less substantial business section. It does issue a two business weekly supplements (*le Monde argent* on Sundays and *Le Monde économie* on Mondays) yet the articles in these supplements were not coded since we only included daily sections as did the other national teams. In the end, over 40% of the articles coded from *Le Figaro* were featured in the business news section whereas this is the case for only 13,7% of the articles coded *Le Monde*. This may also account for the fact that slightly more articles were coded in *Le Figaro* compared to *Le Monde* since one of the issue fields that we studied was monetary policy, a topic addressed in business/economy pages.

8% of the articles in *Le Monde* were classified in the “no differentiation between sections” category. They are in fact from the *Union européenne* section, a special section on the EU that appeared with the launch of the euro at the beginning of 2001. This must be kept in mind when analyzing results in the year 2001 and 2002 since it provides an outlet for claims in various policy sectors with a European dimension or for claims on European integration that did not exist before.

The fact that we selected articles in the business sections yet in others (science, agriculture) means that article on one of the policy sector we study (monetary politics) will be overrepresented in our sample. In the French case, given the structure of *Le Figaro*, we thus

expect right-leaning business views to be dominant in our sample. Three quarters of all the articles in our database from the business/economy section appear in fact in *Le Figaro*.

Table 1.4a: Source of article by paper

Source	By paper, in %				Total	
	Monde	Figaro	OF	Huma	In %	(N)
Own cov.: foreign correspondent	28,6	19,2	1,8	9,9	22,5	518
Own cov.: nat. office editor /journalist	63,9	77,1	94,5	90,1	72,2	1660
National press agency	5,5	1,3	–	–	3	70
Other EU press agency	,8	–	–	–	,3	8
Non-EU press agency	,1	–	–	–	–	1
Other national media source	,4	–	1,8	–	,2	5
Other EU media source	,3	1,9	1,8	–	1,1	26
Non-EU media source	–	,5	–	–	,3	6
Other source	,4	0	–	–	,2	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	1009	1143	55	91		2298

For each relevant article, we coded the source of the information as indicated at the beginning or at the end of the article. When several news agencies are quoted for the same article, the first mentioned is retained.

As the table suggests, almost all articles regardless of the newspaper take credit for news coverage, although we know that they subscribe to news agencies. In other words, journalists use agency release in their own articles. The French news agency AFP is the quoted source for 3% of the articles, usually very short items known as “*brèves*” in French. Yet *Le Figaro* rarely signs its brèves while this is more often the case in *Le Monde*.

The two broadsheets have a higher number of correspondants abroad. It is therefore not surprising that foreign correspondents sign more articles than in the regional or in the Communist paper. In our database of *Le Monde* articles, more than a quarter are written by foreign correspondents, still reflecting a tradition of the newspaper as a reference in “diplomatic” news.

Table 1.4b: Source of article by year

Source	By year, in %					Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2001	2002	In %	(N)
Own coverage: foreign correspondent	24,1	21,9	17,5	24,5	27,7	22,5	518
Own cov.: nat. office editor /journalist	66,3	73,5	76	72,5	69,1	72,2	1660
National press agency	7,2	4,3	2,4	1,8	2,4	3	70
Other EU press agency	,8	–	,6	–	,2	,3	8
Non-EU press agency	5	–	–	–	–	0	1
Other national media source	,4	–	,5	–	–	,2	5
Other EU media source	–	–	2,5	1,2	,3	1,1	26
Non-EU media source	–	–	,5	–	,3	,3	6
Other source	,8	,4	,1	–	–	,2	4
Total (N)	100 373	100 412	100 1119	100 586	100 921	100	3411

No clear trend is visible. Please note that the year 2001 is only based on the European sample, which may favour foreign sources or correspondents and the year 2000 includes two additional papers compared to other years.

Still, if one considers only 1990, 1995 and 2002, there are no significant changes.

Table 1.5: Articles with and without claims

Articles	Number of articles (N)	In % of database
Articles without claims	509	22,1
Articles with claims (new claims)	1677	72,9
Articles with claims (already coded claims)	113	4,9
Total	2299	100

Over three quarters of all articles that were found relevant for our study contain claims. More than one in five article was a factual text on the selected topics. In only 5% of the cases, articles contained claims that had already been coded in other articles. Items in the business/economy section relevant for monetary politics yet that simply state exchange rate or interest rate account for some of these articles without claim. The others featured claims that we discounted because they had taken place more than two weeks in the past according to our common coding rules.

2. Claim-level

General

Table 2.1: Number of claims coded per year: total, full sample, European sample

Year	Claims coded (in % within sample) from		Total	
	full sample issue	reduced European sample issue	In %	(N)
1990	15,2	5	11,1	287
1995	12,6	8	10,6	276
2000	37	35,4	36,3	938
2001	.	30,6	17	356
2002	35,2	19,7	29	730
Total	100	100	100	
(N)	1423	1164		2587

A newspaper article can contain one or more different claims; the total number of 2587 claims in 1677 articles containing new claims means that the statistical average number of claims per article is about one and a half (1.54 claims). Since the early years are coded with a halved sample, there is an increase of claims making on the seven topics we analyse.

Location

Table 2.2a: Country where claim was made by year

	In % within year				Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2002	In %	(N)
Germany (incl. GDR)	4,4	7,3	6,3	3,8	5,2	74
France	46,8	51,2	55,9	47,5	50,5	719
UK	3	4	3	3	3,9	55
Italy	2	2	1	2	1,3	18
Spain	1	2	0	1	1,4	20
Netherlands	1	1	1	0	,4	5
Other pre-1995 EU members	5	1	3	3	2,9	41
Austria, Finland, Sweden	3	1	5	2	1,8	25
EU seats	8	6	13	13	12,6	180
Switzerland	1	1	1	1	,5	7
10 upcoming enlargement countries	4	2	4	4	1,4	20
Other Eur. countries (excl. CIS countries)	2	2	1	0	,6	9
Turkey	0	1	0	3	,9	13
Russia (incl. USSR)	4	2	2	1	,8	12
USA	7	6	3	7	4,4	63
Japan	1	2	1	0	,6	9
Middle East	5	1	1	2	2,7	38
UN seats	0	1	1	0	2,1	30
NATO seats	0	1	0	0	,3	4
Rest of the world	2	4	3	6	5,7	81
Total	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	217	179	526	501		1423

[Based on full sample issues only. Data from SZ+FAZ, in 2000 also LVZ+Bild.]

Overall, half of all claims reported in the French dailies that we selected were actually made on the national territory. This leaves another half of claims made elsewhere in the world. 12,6% of all claims are made from the seats of the European Union, (only coded as such when the respective claims are not national matters of the respective countries where the cities lie). Since we code articles on European integration and monetary policy, this explains that claims emanating from Brussels or the seat of the BCE in Frankfurt get some echo in the national press. The coverage of claims made in EU seats increase in recent years (2000 and 2002), reflecting perhaps the greater role of Frankfurt after the launch of the euro. The individual foreign countries that are most covered are France's neighbour Germany (5,2% of all claims each), the remaining superpower the USA (4,4%) and the United Kingdom (3,9%). That the press pays more attention to what happens in the big three (USA, Germany and the UK), where the quality press has correspondents, shows that the press reinforces in its coverage common sense about the hierarchy of economic and geopolitical power in the world.

Table 2.2b: Country where claim was made by issue field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Germany (incl. GDR)	11	2,6	2,4	4,5	1,2		6,9	5,2	74
France	37,1	66,4	55,2	22,6	89,3	91,7	44,9	50,5	719
UK	4,6	2,6	5,5	5,8	1,2	3,8	2,6	3,9	55
Italy	1,3	3,4	1,2	–	2,4	1,3	1,2	1,3	18
Spain	1,3	3,4	4,2	–	–	–	1,4	1,4	20
Netherlands	0,8	–	0,6	0,4	–	–	0,2	0,4	5
Other pre-1995 EU members	3	–	3,6	1,2	–	–	5,9	2,9	41
Austria, Finland, Sweden	1,7	–	2,4	–	–	–	4	1,8	25
EU seats	21,1	13,8	4,2	2,1	1,2	–	23,9	12,6	180
Switzerland	1,3	–	1,2	0,4	–	–	0,2	0,5	7
new members	–	2,6	0,6	0,8	–	–	3,3	1,4	20
Other Euro (excl. CIS)	0,4	–	0,6	0,8	1,2	–	0,9	0,6	9
Turkey	–	–	–	2,1	–	–	1,9	0,9	13
Russia (incl. USSR)	0,4	1,7	3	1,2	1,2	–	–	0,8	12
USA	8	–	2,4	16	–	0,6	–	4,4	63
Japan	2,5	1,7	–	0,4	–	–	–	0,6	9
Middle East	–	–	1,2	14,8	–	–	–	2,7	38
UN seats	0,4	–	0,6	11,1	1,2	–	–	2,1	30
NATO seats	–	–	–	1,6	–	–	–	0,3	4
Rest of the world	5,1	1,7	10,9	14	1,2	2,6	2,6	5,8	82
N (number of claims)	237	116	165	243	84	156	423		1424
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

The geographical distribution of places where claims are made depends largely on the policy field which is concerned. The three policy areas where the number of claims are below average (less than 50%) are: troops deployment, monetary policy and European integration.

Next come agriculture and immigration where a majority of claims are made in France yet where more than a third of claims are made elsewhere. In contrast, in the two domains where there is no delegation of competence upwards to the EU or global level, pensions and education, around nine claims out of ten are made in France, implying that there is very little coverage of developments abroad.

In the case of monetary policies, the number of claims made in France are well below average with 37%. 21% of claims are made in EU seats which include Frankfurt where the European central bank is located. There is still a wide coverage of claims made in the countries with competing currencies: the UK (11%), the US (8%), Japan (2,5%) as well as claims made in Germany (11%), an economic power whose stock market is a reference point for business journalists and home of the Deutschmark, to which other EU currencies were pegged before the advent of the euro and of the BUBA, the reference for independent central banks in Europe before the creation of the ECB.

In the case of troops deployment, the picture of the world as reflected in the media includes first and foremost the USA with 16% of claims located there, less than in France where 22,6% are made but more than at the UN: 11% of claims are made at UN seats. The main area of conflict in the world for French journalists is the Middle East since about 15% of all claims are made in that region.

In the case of European integration, 23,9% are made at a EU seat and 44% are made in France. The other claims are made in a number of countries. Claims made in Germany are given more coverage (c. 7%) yet there are claims that are reported from all the corners of Europe including candidate countries like Turkey.

Table 3.1: Region in own country where claim was made by issue field

	In % within issue field							Total	
	MON	AGR	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EU I	In %	(N)
Paris (capital)	94,3	64,9	63,7	96,4	84	69,9	91,6	80,8	581
Other 4 largest cities	-	-	11	1,8	5,3	-	,5	2,2	16
Other locations in France	5,7	35,1	25,3	1,8	10,7	30,1	7,9	17	122
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
(N)	88	77	91	55	75	143	190		719

[Based on full sample issues only, ISFIELD1, only the first claim per article, only claims made in France. "Other 4 largest cities" are Lyon, Marseille, Lille, and Toulouse.

Looking at the place where claims are made can give information about the degree of centralisation or decentralisation of a political system as well as the locus where media spotlights shine. With over 80% of claims made in the capital city, Paris is the city of media lights and remains the center of political activity and public debate. The quality press titles that we used to create our database, *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*, both have seats in Paris and, although they have correspondents in other places as well a access to the AFP network, they give little space for events outside Paris. One should remember that Paris is not only the seat of government, parliament and the high courts but also the center of economic governance structures (e. g. the French stock market is located at the heart of the city).

Still, the fact that one out of five claims is made outside of Paris in a country that used to symbolize centralism is not negligible. Yet our data does not seem to suggest that other large cities in France are becoming alternative centers of political activity. Only 2,2% of the claims are made in the four largest cities after Paris whereas 17% are made throughout the rest of the territory. Only in the field of immigration do we observe that one in ten claims is made in the four largest cities aside from Paris, since they are large urban centers with high percentages of migrant populations.

Public political action is most concentrated in Paris in policy fields that involve the international level: troop deployment, monetary policy, and European integration. One way of putting it is that France looks at Brussels, Frankfurt or Washington from Paris.

Immigration is a national prerogative yet prefects order deportations throughout France. Therefore mobilizations around these type of decisions are spread through the territory with more than a third of all claims made outside of Paris. As it happens, a lot of political and media attention in this policy field has focused since 1999 on the small village of Sangatte near Calais and Lille in the North since a Red Cross camp was set up to house foreigners

attempting to get to the United Kingdom. There also are significant branches of the *sans papiers* social movement in Lyon and Lille.

In line with the distribution of competences in education policy, which is mainly under regional and local authority in France, thirty per cent of all claims in that policy field are made in cities or regions other than the capital or the next four biggest cities. Yet it is unclear whether this is because of the devolution of competence or simply the fact that there are schools and pupils everywhere in France...

Similarly with agriculture the fact that 35% of all claims in this policy field are not made in Paris or the four largest cities aside from Paris is not surprising since farms by definition are not located in urban areas.

There is no clear link between the level of decision-making in policy fields and the level of centralization of claims, since agriculture and immigration are not “regional” or “local” policies. Moreover, the fact that some claims are made outside of Paris does not mean that they are made by local authorities or local civil society. Executive leaders and politicians alike like to “sillonner le territoire” (to crisscross the territory) of France to show their proximity to “the people.”

Actors (claim makers)

Table 4.1a: Actors of claims by issue field (detail)

	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	N
whole polities							0,2	0,1	1
politicians	2,1	2,6	9,1	3,7	7,1	5,8	10,4	6,4	91
former states(wo)men	2,1	–	0,6	1,6	–	–	2,4	1,4	20
government/executive	34,2	54,3	40,6	64,2	27,4	32,7	48,2	45,3	645
legislative	5,9	3,4	5,5	5,8	3,6	3,2	13,0	7,3	104
judiciary	–	0,9	7,3	0,4	1,2	3,2	0,7	1,6	23
police	–	–	6,1	–	–	–	–	0,7	10
military	–	–	–	4,9	–	–	–	0,8	12
central banks	29,1	–	–	–	–	–	–	4,8	69
soc secu	–	–	–	–	2,4	–	–	0,1	2
other state exec	0,8	1,7	1,8	0,4	1,2	3,2	0,5	1,1	16
political parties	2,5	0,9	1,8	0,8	1,2	1,3	7,8	3,4	48
unions	0,4	–	–	0,4	36,9	–	0,5	2,5	35
employers	2,1	1,7	–	–	7,1	–	0,7	1,1	16
churches	0,4	–	0,6	4,1	–	1,3	1,2	1,3	19
media	5,9	4,3	4,8	3,3	2,4	2,6	9,2	5,6	80
farmers	–	20,7	–	–	–	–	–	1,7	24
educational professionals	0,4	0,9	–	–	1,2	30,8	–	3,6	51
financial experts	11,8	–	–	0,8	1,2	–	0,5	2,3	33
other scientific	0,4	4,3	0,6	2,9	–	3,2	2,4	2,0	29
students	–	0,9	0,6	–	–	10,9	–	1,3	19
other prof	–	–	0,6	–	–	–	–	0,1	1
consumer	–	0,9	–	–	–	–	–	0,1	1
migrant	–	–	14,5	0,8	–	–	–	1,8	26
pro- and anti-EU groups	0,4	–	–	–	–	–	0,7	0,3	4
human rights orgs	–	–	2,4	0,4	–	–	0,2	0,4	6
welfare organisations	–	–	–	–	1,2	–	–	0,1	1
peace groups	–	–	–	0,4	–	–	–	0,1	1
elderly	–	–	–	–	3,6	–	–	0,2	3
rebel forces/guerilla	–	–	–	0,8	–	–	–	0,1	2
other civil soc	–	1,7	1,8	2,9	2,4	1,9	1,2	1,5	22
the general public	0,4	–	0,6	0,8	–	–	–	0,3	4
unknown/unspecified	0,8	0,9	0,6	0,4	–	–	0,2	0,4	6
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1424

Table 4.1b: Actors of claims by issue field (broad categories)

	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	N
state and party actors	76,8	63,8	72,7	81,9	44,0	49,4	83,0	73,0	1040
economic interest groups	14,3	22,4	–	1,2	45,2	–	1,7	7,6	108
media and journalists	5,9	4,3	4,8	3,3	2,4	2,6	9,2	5,6	80
other civil society actors	1,7	8,6	21,2	12,3	8,3	48,1	5,7	13,0	185
general/unknown/unspecified	1,3	0,9	1,2	1,2	–	–	0,5	0,8	11
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1424

Three quarters of the claims that we have studied have been made by state or party actors. 13% are made by civil society actors and 7,6% by economic interest groups (pensions and agriculture are the fields where interest groups dominate). The overall weight of civil society actors depends on its presence in the field of education (where student and teacher organizations alone make up 41% of claimants) and to a lesser extent in the field of immigration, which is partly structured as a confrontation between state authorities and pro-migrant groups (14,5% of claims in that field are made by migrant groups).

The only fields that are still very much the object of national debates and policies, high school education and pensions, are also the only ones where state and party actors do not dominate and where there is almost parity between state and society voices in the press (unions and employers in the case of pensions, teachers and parents or pupils in the other).

Conversely, issues taking place beyond the nation-state, troops deployment and debates about European integration are the ones in which more than 4 out of 5 claims are made by state and party actors. In foreign affairs, at least one in ten claims is made by a civil society actor. This is not the case for European integration. This issue in the press is apparently only presented as a conversation between institutional actors and elected officials.

This implies that activities by the hundreds of NGOs and interest groups at the European level are not covered in the national written press. Moreover, this result echoes complaints by the journalists interviewed in WP6 about the fact that EU news is boring and “institutional” compared to *questions de société*. Qualitative studies on news coverage of the EU also underline this on-going dilemma of EU institutional coverage (Baisnée 2003; Marchetti 2004).

Journalists are more likely to make claims on their own in the field of monetary policy and regarding European integration.

Table 4.2: Actor type by issue field

<i>ACTOR TYPE</i>	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
unorganised collectivity	3,0	1,7	4,8	1,2	–	5,1	0,5	2,1	30
named rep of unorganized collective	1,7	4,3	1,8	2,5	1,2	9,0	7,1	4,4	63
organisation or institution	21,5	38,3	43,0	30,9	39,3	34,0	17,5	28,2	401
anonymous spokesperson(s)	6,3	1,7	5,5	4,5	4,8	3,2	6,4	5,1	73
named spokesperson(s)	67,5	53,9	44,8	60,9	54,8	48,7	68,6	60,2	856
total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1423

The field of European integration is the most “personalized” with over two thirds of claims made by named spokespersons. This is also the case of monetary politics. As we will see, this has to do with the forms of action in these domains: verbal statements are the main venue for action whereas claimants in other fields display a larger repertoire for action. Organizations and institutions are the other important category of actors presented in the press as claimants yet there again in monetary politics and European integration, the figures are below average.

Table 4.3: Thirty most often mentioned spokespersons

	number of claims	% of all claims
Named spokespersons	564	39,6
1. Chirac, Jacques	29	2,0
2. Jospin, Lionel	20	1,4
3. Prodi, Romano	12	,8
4. Delors, Jacques	12	,8
5. Fabius, Laurent	11	,8
6. Sarkozy, Nicolas	11	,8
7. Blair, Tony	10	,7
8. Lang, Jack	10	,7
9. Giscard d'Estaing, Valéry	10	,7
10. Moscovici, Pierre	9	,6
11. Raffarin, Jean-Pierre	9	,6
12. Chevènement, Jean-Pierre	9	,6
13. Solbes, Pedro	8	,6
14. Duisenberg, Wim	8	,6
15. Bayrou, François	8	,6
16. Greenspan, Alan	7	,5
17. Juppé, Alain	7	,5
18. Schröder, Gerhard	7	,5
19. Le Pen, Jean-Marie	6	,4
20. Védrine, Hubert	6	,4
21. Barnier, Michel	6	,4
22. Dumas, Roland	6	,4
23. Bush, George sr.	6	,4
24. Cohn-Bendit, Daniel	5	,4
25. Villiers, Philippe de	5	,4
26. Glavany, Jean	5	,4
27. Allègre, Claude	5	,4
28. Trichet, Jean-Claude	5	,4
29. Haider, Jörg	5	,4
30. Mitterrand, François	5	,4

When measuring which individual spokespersons succeed in placing a claim in the media, we find the head of state at the top rank, *Jacques Chirac* (president since 1995) followed by the chief of government in the period that we coded most extensively, *Lionel Jospin* (1997-2002). This should not come as a surprise since they hold the most prominent positions in the

executive. Moreover, Jospin was the Socialist candidate in 1995, a year that we coded in which Chirac was elected.¹ In other words, the two politicians have been the leaders of the mainstream Right and the mainstream left since 1995 and in power in the most recent years that we studied. They make claims in all fields.

One of the standard questions in Eurobarometer surveys to test respondents' knowledge of the EU consists in asking them to find the name of the current President of the European Commission from a list of five names (that includes the name of former Presidents of the Commission). It is interesting to note that Romano Prodi and Jacques Delors appear on a par as claimants in our database based on the French quality press (12 claims each). It is also important to note that they feature as personalities most often subjects of claims just after the President and the Prime Minister. EU personalities, past and current, do have access to the French media. They are "secondus inter pares" among chief executives just after French leaders.

To be cited by a media source when making a statement enough to feature in the top 30 list, you have to be a man. Then you must be a chief of government of a foreign power (*Blair, Bush, Schroeder...*), or a minister, or a commissioner or the head of a EU institution, or a former statesman, or the leader of political party.

The only odd character on our list is *Jörg Haider*, leader of the extreme-right in Austria, the only foreign party leader that does not head a government. His claims are almost as present as that of *Jean-Marie Le Pen*, the leader of the National Front. Haider was at the heart of European-wide controversy in 2000 and in France it led to a debate. Personalization is not a surprising feature in the case of the extreme right that are centered around a charismatic leader.

It is interesting to note that the commissioners that in some fields where there is EU/EC competence, national ministers are often named whereas the Commissioner in charge of the sector is not.

In the field of monetary politics, where claims are very Europeanized, we find both *Wim Duisenberg* (8 claims) and *Jean-Claude Trichet* (5 claims). They were in turn in charge of the ECB. We also find *Pedro Solbes* (8 claims), the Commissioner in charge of Economic and Monetary Affairs. They are nominally present. The only French economics minister named in claims in any significant manner is *Laurent Fabius* (11 claims). Yet, the head of the Federal Reserve *Alan Greenspan* (7 claims) is also quoted and named. Personalization is a common feature in the way that business news is covered with expressions such as "the market is waiting, the market reacted, etc..." but here it is also a consequence of the actual job of ECB heads: they make statements in press conferences about interest rates.

In the case of agriculture, *Jean Glavany*, French minister of agriculture between 1998 and 2002, is named in five claims whereas the European Commissioner responsible for Agriculture, Rural Development and Fisheries since 1995, *Franz Fischler*, is quoted three times. The fact that Fischler is not as present as Glavany cannot be attributed to his lack of efforts as far as political communication is concerned. A recent study on commissioners that

¹ It should be noted that in 1990 Mitterrand was still president yet in our sample he only made 5 claims whereas his Prime minister Michel Rocard does not feature in our top 30.

focused on Fischler has shown that he has spent a lot of time and energy reorganizing his communication strategy and making public statements all over Europe — not just in Brussels and his own country— (Joana and Smith , p. 178-182).

In the field of immigration, Interior ministers dominate, with eleven claims by *Nicolas Sarkozy*, hyperactive minister since May 2002 and nine by *Jean-Pierre Chevènement* (minister between 1997 and 2000). Antonio Vitorino, the European Commissioner in charge of Justice and Home affairs seems unknown to the French press. The Commission however has the power of co-initiative in this field that is an EC competence since 1999.

In the field of European integration, we find former statesmen that have played a role in EC/EU history: *Jacques Delors*, former French minister of Finance (1981-1984) and former head of the European Commission (1985-1995) and *Valéry Giscard d'Estaing*, former president of France (1974-1981) and head of the Convention on the future of Europe in 2002.

It should be underlined that dissenting views on European integration can enter the public sphere in France. On the Right, eurosceptic leader *Philippe de Villiers* makes five claims, as many as *Daniel Cohn-Bendit* of the Green party, a euroenthusiast that wants another Europe. Other anti-EU leaders are present: *Jean-Pierre Chevènement* and *Jean-Marie Le Pen*.

Michel Barnier, one of the two French commissioner, is in charge of the reform of institutions and was a Commission representative in the Convention. Since we code articles on European integration, it is not surprising to see that he makes six claims. He is the only commissioner aside from *Pedro Solbes* in the top thirty list of named spokespersons. The fact that he is French and that he still is much involved in French politics may account for his presence. Yet his portfolio seems more important since he makes all his claims on European integration rather than other fields. Moreover, the other Commissioner, Pascal Lamy is not present in the list of personalities making many claims.

Yet, it should be underlined that no person from civil society (interest group, trade union or NGO leader) is featured in the 30 personalities most quoted in the media sources that we use. Not even all the party leaders are.

Table 4.4: Actor scope by broad actor categories

	<i>state + party</i>	<i>eco interest</i>	<i>media</i>	<i>civil society</i>	<i>unspecified</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Supranational: UN	96,2	–	–	3,8	–	100	26
Other supra	62,5	6,3	–	31,3	–	100	16
EU	96,6	0,9	0,4	1,7	0,4	100	233
Other European supra	100,0	–	–	–	–	100	8
Multilateral	55,6	22,2	–	22,2	–	100	9
Bilateral	100,0	–	–	–	–	100	1
Germany	80,3	7,6	7,6	4,5	–	100	66
France	60,4	12,1	7,4	19,4	0,7	100	680
UK	61,7	6,7	20,0	11,7	–	100	60
Italy	76,9	15,4	–	7,7	–	100	13
Spain	86,7	–	–	6,7	6,7	100	15
Netherlands	100,0	–	–	–	–	100	3
Other pre-1995 EU	95,8	–	–	–	4,2	100	24
Austria, Finland, Sweden	89,3	–	3,6	7,1	–	100	28
Switzerland	25,0	25,0	50,0	–	–	100	4
Other euro ex CIS	100,0	–	–	–	–	100	16
Turkey	84,6	7,7	–	7,7	–	100	13
Russia	92,9	7,1	–	–	–	100	14
USA	82,6	4,3	7,2	5,8	–	100	69
Japan	87,5	–	–	–	12,5	100	8
Middle east	76,2	–	–	21,4	2,4	100	42
Rest of the world	76,8	1,4	5,8	15,9	–	100	69
N	1039	105	80	183	10		1417
%	73,3	7,4	5,6	12,9	0,7	100	

Regardless of their scope (national, EU, European or supranational) and regardless of the country of the world where the actor is located, state and party actors have greater access to the French press that we coded.²

When covering news in other countries, news items do include the positions of non-state actors. There are idiosyncracies in the ways that correspondents cover news abroad (e. g. the fact that one in five claims by British actors are made by media actors, the highest percentage anywhere).

Regarding the supranational level, it seems that it is very difficult to find claims by civil society actors that can be identified as having solely a EU dimension, whereas supranational NGOs and multilateral NGO initiatives find their way into the French press. This is also the case for interest groups. Yet this is hardly surprising. In the case of interest groups, one can imagine why the actions of the national-level organization (farmers' union, employers' union, ...) are reported instead of that of the eurogroups and federations (COPA, UNICE, ...). In the case of civil society actors, the results confirm existing studies on Brussels-based NGOs (Guiraudon 2000, 2001; Imig and Tarrow 2001). Access to the national media is not a priority for EU NGO activists. Their competence and functions lie elsewhere. In the activists' division of labor, awareness-raising and public denunciation can be achieved by their national counterparts while they focus on agenda-setting, making proposals, following negotiations, in

² There are only four cases where claimants are in Switzerland, two of them are claims by journalists used as proxy to find the Swiss position by their French colleagues.

brief lobbying. Moreover, among the groups present in Brussels, many have an international dimension (Greenpeace, Amnesty International, etc.) and national chapters or sections so that they cannot be labelled simply as “EU” NGOs. Finally, studies on the Brussels press corps (news agencies and journalists) suggest that their priority does not consist in covering all the regular demonstrations in front of the Justus Lipsius building (Baisnée 2003, Bastin 2004).

Table 4.5: actor scope by issue field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
Supranational: UN	0,9		1,2	8,7	1,2			1,8	26
Other supranational	1,7	0,9	1,2	3,3			0,2	1,1	16
EU	28,0	13,8	5,5	2,1	1,2		32,5	16,4	233
Other Euro supra				0,8			1,4	0,6	8
Multilateral	0,4	2,6		2,1				0,6	9
Bilateral							0,2	0,1	1
Germany	12,1	2,6	1,8	4,1	1,2		5,0	4,7	66
France	31,0	65,5	54,5	20,7	90,5	92,3	40,8	48,0	680
UK	5,2	2,6	6,7	5,0	1,2	3,8	3,6	4,2	60
Italy	0,9		1,2	0,4	2,4	1,3	0,9	0,9	13
Spain	1,3	2,6	3,6				0,7	1,1	15
Netherlands	0,4		0,6				0,2	0,2	3
Other pre-1995 EU	2,6	0,9	1,8				3,3	1,7	24
Austria, Finland, Sweden	1,7		3,0				4,5	2,0	28
Switzerland	0,4		0,6	0,4			0,2	0,3	4
Other euro ex CIS	0,4		2,4	2,1	1,2		1,2	1,1	16
Turkey			0,6	2,1			1,7	0,9	13
Russia	0,4	1,7	2,4	2,1	1,2		0,2	1,0	14
USA	8,2	0,9	1,2	19,0		0,6		4,9	69
Japan	2,2	1,7		0,4				0,6	8
Middle East			2,4	15,7				3,0	42
Rest of the world	2,2	4,3	9,1	11,2		1,9	3,3	4,9	69
N	232	116	165	242	84	156	422		1417
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 4.6 Actor scope by year

	1989	1990	1994	1995	1999	2000	2002	%	N
Supranational: UN		1,5		1,7		2,1	1,8	1,8	26
Other supranational		1,5		1,1		1,2	1,0	1,1	16
EU		8,8		16,9	50,0	16,9	19,3	16,5	233
Other European supranational		1,5		1,7		0,4		0,6	8
Multilateral	16,7	0,5		0,6		0,2	0,8	0,6	9
Bilateral						0,2		0,1	1
Germany		4,9		6,8	50,0	5,4	3,0	4,7	66
France		44,9		48,0		51,4	47,0	48,0	679
UK		6,3		1,7		3,5	5,2	4,2	60
Italy		0,5		1,7			1,8	0,9	13
Spain		1,0		0,6		1,7	0,6	1,1	15
Netherlands	8,3			0,6		0,2		0,2	3
Other pre-1995 EU-members						1,9	2,8	1,7	24
Austria, Finland, Sweden				1,1		4,2	0,8	2,0	28
Switzerland				0,6		0,6		0,3	4
10 upcoming enlargement countries				2,8		1,7	0,4	1,1	16
Other European countries (excl. CIS)		0,5		1,1		0,4	1,6	0,9	13
Turkey	8,3	1,5		0,6		0,4	1,4	1,0	14
Russia	25,0	10,7		4,5		2,1	5,0	4,9	69
USA	8,3			1,1		1,0		0,6	8
Japan		7,3		1,7		2,5	2,2	3,0	42
Middle East	33,3	8,8	100,0	5,1		2,1	5,2	4,9	69
N	12	205	1	177	2	521	498		1416
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Over time, actors with a EU scope have gained a better access to the French press. This has not been at the detriment of French actors nor at the expense of other supranational actors. Instead there has been a decline in the number of claimants from other parts of the world (including the US, the Middle East, and the rest of the world). This suggests that EU news are competing with international news rather than national news, which is stable. The trend on French TV and radio and also in news weeklies has been to cut down on the number of foreign correspondents, including in Brussels. In the quality press, so far Brussels has been spared yet foreign coverage does not grow or regresses.

Table 4.7a-g: Actor scope by year, separate for each issue field

a. Monetary policy

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
Supranational: un	–	2,2	1,2	–	0,9	2
Other supranational	4,5	2,2	1,2	1,3	1,7	4
EU	9,1	13,0	31,7	38,5	28,0	65
Multilateral	–	–	–	1,3	0,4	1
Germany	13,6	13,0	17,1	5,1	12,1	28
France	36,4	39,1	28,0	29,5	31,0	72
UK	4,5	4,3	2,4	9,0	5,2	12
Italy	4,5	2,2	–	–	0,9	2
Spain	–	2,2	1,2	1,3	1,3	3
Netherlands	–	–	–	–	0,4	1
Other pre-1995 eu-members	–	–	4,9	2,6	2,6	6
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	4,3	–	2,6	1,7	4
Switzerland	–	2,2	–	–	0,4	1
Other European countries ex CIS	–	–	–	1,3	0,4	1
Russia	–	2,2	–	–	0,4	1
USA	18,2	6,5	8,5	6,4	8,2	19
Japan	–	2,2	3,7	–	2,2	5
Rest of the world	9,1	4,3	–	1,3	2,2	5
N	24	46	84	78		232
%	100	100	100	100	100	

b. agriculture

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
Other supranational	9,1	–	–	–	0,9	1
EU	18,2	40,0	11,8	12,5	13,8	16
Multilateral	–	–	1,3	8,3	2,6	3
Germany	–	20,0	1,3	4,2	2,6	3
France	63,6	40,0	72,4	50,0	65,5	76
Uk	9,1	–	1,3	4,2	2,6	3
Spain	–	–	3,9	–	2,6	3
Other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	–	4,2	0,9	1
Russia	–	–	1,3	4,2	1,7	2
USA	–	–	–	4,2	0,9	1
Japan	–	–	2,6	–	1,7	2
Rest of the world	–	–	3,9	8,3	4,3	5
N	11	5	76	24	116	116
%	100	100	100	100	100	

c. immigration

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
Supranational: UN	–	–	2,0	1,3	1,2	2
Other supranational	–	–	2,0	1,3	1,2	2
EU	14,3	4,2	–	7,9	5,5	9
Germany	–	–	–	3,9	1,8	3
France	50,0	70,8	49,0	53,9	54,5	90
UK	7,1	–	7,8	7,9	6,7	11
Italy	–	4,2	–	1,3	1,2	2
Spain	7,1	–	7,8	1,3	3,6	6
Netherlands	–	4,2	–	–	0,6	1
Other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	–	3,9	1,8	3
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	5,9	2,6	3,0	5
Switzerland	–	–	2,0	–	0,6	1
Other European countries ex CIS	–	–	5,9	1,3	2,4	4
Turkey	–	–	2,0	–	0,6	1
Russia	–	–	–	5,3	2,4	4
USA	7,1	–	2,0	–	1,2	2
Middle East	–	–	7,8	–	2,4	4
Rest of the world	14,3	16,7	5,9	7,9	9,1	15
N	14	24	51	76		165
%	100	100	100	100	100	

d. troops deployment

	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	–	3,7	7,7	22,5	8,2	8,7	21
other supranational	–	1,2	3,8	10,0	2,4	3,3	8
EU	–	–	–	2,5	4,7	2,1	5
other European supranational	–	1,2	3,8	–	–	0,8	2
multilateral	20	1,2	3,8	–	1,2	2,1	5
Germany	–	4,9	7,7	–	4,7	4,1	10
France	–	25,9	19,2	22,5	17,6	20,7	50
UK	–	3,7	–	2,5	9,4	5,0	12
Italy	–	–	–	–	1,2	0,4	1
Switzerland	–	–	–	2,5	–	0,4	1
other european countries ex CIS	–	–	11,5	5,0	–	2,1	5
Turkey	–	1,2	3,8	–	3,5	2,1	5
Russia	10	2,5	–	–	2,4	2,1	5
USA	30	21,0	19,2	7,5	21,2	19,0	46
Japan	–	–	3,8	–	–	0,4	1
Middle East	–	18,5	11,5	22,5	12,9	15,7	38
Rest of the world	40	14,8	3,8	2,5	10,6	11,2	27
N	10	81	26	40	85		242
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	

e. pensions

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	–	–	–	2,4	1,2	1
EU	–	–	–	2,4	1,2	1
Germany	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
France	100	88,9	85,7	92,7	90,5	76
UK	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
Italy	–	11,1	–	2,4	2,4	2
Other european countries ex CIS	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
Russia	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
N	6	9	28	41		84
%	100	100	100	100	100	

f. education

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
France	81,5	88,9	100,0	91,1	92,3	144
UK	18,5	–	–	2,2	3,8	6
Italy	–	–	–	4,4	1,3	2
USA	–	–	–	2,2	0,6	1
Rest of the world	–	11,1	–	–	1,9	3
N	27	19	65	45		156
%	100	100	100	100	100	

g. European integration

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
other supranational	–	–	–	0,7	0,2	1
EU	27,3	42,9	29,1	34,9	32,5	137
other European supranational	4,5	4,1	1,1	–	1,4	6
bilateral	–	–	0,6	–	0,2	1
Germany	6,8	6,1	6,7	2,0	5,0	21
France	47,7	38,8	37,4	43,0	40,6	171
UK	4,5	2,0	5,0	2,0	3,6	15
Italy	–	–	–	2,7	1,0	4
Spain	2,3	–	0,6	0,7	0,7	3
Netherlands	–	–	0,6	–	0,2	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	3,4	5,4	3,3	14
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	10,6	–	4,5	19
Switzerland	–	–	0,6	–	0,2	1
other European countries ex CIS	–	4,1	1,7	–	1,2	5
Turkey	–	2,0	0,6	3,4	1,7	7
Russia	2,3	–	–	–	0,2	1
Rest of the world	4,5	–	2,2	5,4	3,3	14
N	44	49	179	149		421
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Action forms

Table 5.1: Forms of action by issue field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
political decision	15,7	18,9	16,6	10,6	7,3	11,8	6,5	11,6	156
executive action	0,9	1,8	5,7	7,2	1,2	2,6	0,3	2,7	36
judicial action	0,9	0,9	7,0	–	1,2	4,6	–	1,6	22
non-specified statement	39,5	45,9	33,8	39,1	42,7	31,6	42,4	39,4	530
other verbal statement	27,8	21,6	22,9	18,7	28,0	27,0	31,3	26,0	350
meeting	14,8	7,2	5,1	20,0	14,6	7,9	18,5	14,2	191
direct-democratic action	0,4	–	0,6	–	–	–	0,3	0,2	3
protest action	–	3,6	8,3	4,3	4,9	14,5	0,8	4,2	56
N	223	111	157	235	82	152	384	1344	1344
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

The majority of all claims are verbal statements (public speeches, press communiqués and conferences, interviews, etc... and non-specified forms). Two other types of events are reported: political decisions and meetings. Protest action overall make up only 4,2% of all claims and seems to be present in significant numbers in onlky two policy fields (education and immigration). European integration is the topic of debate with two thirds of all claims being up of verbal statements.

NO SPSS RESULTS EQUIVALENT TO GERMAN REPORT TABLE ACTION FORMS BY ACTOR CATEGORIES: NEEDS TO BE CHECKED.

Table 5.2: Forms of action by actor scope

	<i>political</i>	<i>executive</i>	<i>judicial</i>	<i>N-S</i>	<i>other verbal</i>	<i>meeting</i>	<i>demo</i>	<i>protest</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
supra: UN	15,4	7,7	–	46,2	11,5	19,2	–	–	100	26
other supra	12,5	6,3	–	18,8	37,5	25,0	–	–	100	16
EU	15,1	0,4	0,9	39,7	25,0	18,5	–	0,4	100	232
other Euro supra	25,0	–	–	25,0	12,5	37,5	–	–	100	8
multilateral	–	–	–	66,7	22,2	11,1	–	–	100	9
bilateral	–	–	–	100,0	–	–	–	–	100	1
national	11,2	2,8	0,8	39,3	28,1	13,9	0,2	3,6	100	963
regional	–	6,1	24,2	27,3	6,1	–	3,0	33,3	100	33
local	10,2	6,1	8,2	46,9	10,2	–	–	18,4	100	49
unclassifiable	–	–	–	57,1	28,6	14,3	–	–	100	7
	156	36	22	530	350	191	3	56	100	1344
	11,6	2,7	1,6	39,4	26,0	14,2	0,2	4,2	100	

Most of the protests reported in the French dailies that we coded are local or regional in scope. This confirms previous studies such as Imig and Tarrow (2001) on the small

percentage of EU or transnational protests. We saw earlier that civil society actors were rarely presented as having a EU scope. Similarly protest action with a EU scope are rarely reported. The pattern of reporting on EU events resembles reporting of UN ones: most of the claims are statements, followed by meetings and political decisions. Nor is it so different from the pattern observed in national claims reported.

Addressees

Table 6.1: Presence of addressee by issue field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
no indirect object	28,3	24,1	21,2	14,8	20,2	19,9	20,8	21,2	302
addressee	64,1	70,7	74,5	79,4	78,6	75,0	77,1	74,4	1059
supported actor	4,2	1,7	2,4	3,7	–	3,2	1,2	2,5	35
opponent	3,4	3,4	1,8	2,1	1,2	1,9	0,9	2,0	28
N	237	116	165	243	84	156	423		1424
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

In about three quarters of all cases, claim makers address other organisations or individuals, and ask that they take action or stop a specific action, or hold them responsible for a certain situation. They support or criticise them in another 5% of cases. All these forms are summarised here as indirect object actors or addressee in general.

Monetary politics is the field in our study with the larger portion of claims (28,3%) without any kind of addressee. This may result from the prevalence of statements describing the current economic situation without passing judgement on those responsible for it or from the fact that decisions in this field, the modification or maintenance of interests rates by central banks, are not addressed to political actors.

Table 6.2a: Addressees by issue field (broad categories)

	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	N
state and party actors	95,9	84,1	85,4	98,6	62,7	71,2	97,6	90,0	1010
economic interest groups	1,2	10,2	–	–	32,8	0,8	1,2	3,4	38
media and journalists	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,3	0,1	1
other civil society actors	2,9	5,7	14,6	1,4	4,5	28,0	0,9	6,5	73
N	170	88	130	207	67	125	335		1122
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 6.2b: Addressees by issue field (in detail)

	MON	AGRI	IMM	TRP	PEN	EDU	EUI	%	N
politicians	1,2	3,4	3,8	1,0	4,5	0,8	3,3	2,4	27
former states(wo)men	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,9	0,3	3
government/executive	68,2	78,4	71,5	79,7	53,7	61,6	77,9	72,8	817
legislative	2,9	1,1	1,5	4,3	–	2,4	14,0	6,0	67
judiciary	–	–	2,3	–	1,5	3,2	0,3	0,8	9
police and internal security agencies	–	–	3,8	–	–	–	–	0,4	5
military	–	–	0,8	12,1	1,5	–	–	2,4	27
central banks	23,5	–	–	–	–	–	–	3,6	40
social security executive organizations	–	–	–	–	1,5	–	–	0,1	1
other state executive agencies	–	1,1	–	–	–	2,4	0,3	0,4	5
political parties	–	–	1,5	1,4	–	0,8	0,9	0,8	9
unions and employees	0,6	–	–	–	13,4	–	0,3	1,0	11
employers organizations and firms	0,6	2,3	–	–	19,4	0,8	0,6	1,7	19
churches and religious groups	–	–	–	0,5	–	–	0,6	0,3	3
media and journalists	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,3	0,1	1
farmers and agricultural organizations	–	8,0	–	–	–	–	–	0,6	7
educational professionals and organizations	–	1,1	–	–	–	16,0	–	1,9	21
economists and financial experts	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,3	0,1	1
other scientific professionals and institutions	–	2,3	–	–	–	–	0,3	0,3	3
students, pupils, and their parents	–	–	–	–	–	10,4	–	1,2	13
consumer organizations and groups	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,1	1
migrant organizations and groups	–	–	12,3	–	–	0,8	–	1,5	17
pro- and anti-European groups	2,4	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,4	4
solidarity and human rights organizations	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
welfare organizations	0,6	–	–	–	3,0	–	–	0,3	3
organizations and groups of the elderly	–	–	–	–	1,5	–	–	0,1	1
rebel forces/guerrilla	–	–	–	1,0	–	–	–	0,2	2
other civil society organizations and groups	–	1,1	1,5	–	–	0,8	–	–	4
N	170	88	130	207	67	125	335		1122
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 6.2c: Addressees by year (broad categories)

	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
state and party actors	100,0	90,8	92,3	89,2	89,5	90,0	1009
economic interest groups	–	1,7	1,4	4,6	3,8	3,4	38
media and journalists	–	–	–	0,3	–	0,1	1
other civil society actors	–	7,5	6,3	5,9	6,7	6,5	73
N	10	174	144	372	421		1121
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 6.2d: Addressees by year (in detail)

	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
politicians	–	1,1	2,1	3,2	2,4	2,4	27
former states(wo)men	–	0,6	–	–	0,5	0,3	3
government/executive	90,0	77,6	71,3	72,3	71,5	72,8	816
legislative	10,0	5,2	5,6	2,7	9,3	6,0	67
judiciary	–	–	0,7	1,3	0,7	0,8	9
police and internal security agencies	–	–	–	0,8	0,5	0,4	5
military	–	4,6	5,6	0,5	2,1	2,4	27
central banks	–	0,6	6,3	6,7	1,2	3,6	40
social security executive organizations	–	–	0,7	–	–	0,1	1
other state executive agencies	–	1,1	–	0,8	–	0,4	5
political parties	–	–	–	0,8	1,4	0,8	9
unions and employees	–	0,6	–	1,1	1,4	1,0	11
employers organizations and firms	–	0,6	0,7	2,7	1,7	1,7	19
churches and religious organizations and groups	–	0,6	–	–	0,5	0,3	3
media and journalists	–	–	–	0,3	–	0,1	1
farmers and agricultural organizations	–	0,6	–	0,8	0,7	0,6	7
educational professionals and organizations	–	2,9	2,8	1,9	1,2	1,9	21
economists and financial experts	–	–	0,7	–	–	0,1	1
other scientific professionals and institutions	–	0,6	–	0,5	–	0,3	3
students, pupils, and their parents	–	1,1	1,4	0,8	1,2	1,2	13
consumer organizations and groups	–	–	–	0,3	–	0,1	1
migrant organizations and groups	–	1,1	0,7	1,1	2,4	1,5	17
pro- and anti-European and groups	–	–	0,7	–	0,7	0,4	4
solidarity and human rights organizations	–	–	–	0,3	–	0,1	1
welfare organizations	–	–	–	0,8	–	0,3	3
organizations and groups of the elderly	–	–	–	–	0,2	0,1	1
rebel forces/guerrilla	–	1,1	–	–	–	0,2	2
other civil society organizations and groups	–	–	0,7	0,3	0,5	0,4	4
N	10	174	144	372	421		1121
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 6.3a: Mean evaluation by category of addressees

<i>main indirect object actor: addressee>supported>opponent</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
state and party actors	-0,18	1010	0,87
economic interest groups	-0,18	38	0,90
media and journalists	-1,00	1	
other civil society actors	-0,26	73	0,88
politicians	-0,67	27	0,68
former states(wo)men	-1,00	3	0,00
government/executive	-0,22	817	0,86
legislative	0,28	67	0,81
judiciary	-0,33	9	0,87
police and internal security agencies	-0,20	5	1,10
military	0,59	27	0,64
central banks	-0,03	40	0,86
social security executive organizations	-1,00	1	
other state executive agencies	-0,40	5	0,89
political parties	-0,33	9	1,00
unions and employees	-0,09	11	0,83
employers organizations and firms	-0,32	19	0,89
churches and religious organizations and groups	1,00	3	0,00
media and journalists	-1,00	1	
farmers and agricultural organizations	-0,14	7	1,07
educational professionals and organizations'	0,33	21	0,80
economists and financial experts	1,00	1	
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	-1,00	3	0,00
students, pupils, and their parents	-0,54	13	0,78
consumer organizations and groups	1,00	1	
migrant organizations and groups	-0,82	17	0,53
pro- and anti-European campaign organizations and groups	-1,00	4	0,00
solidarity and human rights organizations	1,00	1	
welfare organizations	0,00	3	0,00
organizations and groups of the elderly	-1,00	1	
rebel forces/guerrilla	-1,00	2	0,00
other civil society organizations and groups	0,00	4	1,15
Total	-0,18	1122	0,87

Table 6.3b: Mean evaluation by broad addressee scope

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
supranational: UN	0,03	33	0,85
other supranational	0,00	16	0,82
EU	0,01	354	0,85
other European supranational	0,25	8	0,89
multilateral	0,03	30	0,93
bilateral	0,75	4	0,50
Germany	0,00	27	0,92
France	-0,33	391	0,84
UK	-0,33	40	0,86
Italy	-0,46	13	0,88
Spain	-0,75	8	0,71
Netherlands	-1,00	1	
other pre-1995 EU-members	-0,40	10	0,84
Austria, Finland, Sweden	-0,44	18	0,86
Switzerland	0,00	2	1,41
other European countries ex CIS	0,00	3	1,00
Turkey	-0,10	10	0,99
Russia	-0,10	10	0,88
USA	-0,20	69	0,87
Japan	-0,17	6	0,75
Middle East	-0,56	39	0,79
Rest of the world	-0,25	28	0,97
Total	-0,18	1120	0,87

Table 6.4a: Addressee scope by issue field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
supranational: UN	–	1,1	–	15,5	–	–	–	2,9	33
other supranational	1,2	2,3	2,3	4,3	–	–	–	1,4	16
EU	59,2	28,4	13,8	1,4	1,5	–	61,8	31,6	354
other European supranational	–	–	0,8	–	–	–	2,1	0,7	8
multilateral	1,8	1,1	2,3	9,7	1,5	–	0,6	2,7	30
bilateral	–	–	0,8	–	–	–	0,9	0,4	4
Germany	1,8	3,4	1,5	1,0	–	–	5,1	2,4	27
France	14,8	58,0	50,0	10,6	92,5	91,9	15,5	34,9	391
UK	5,3	2,3	6,9	4,3	–	4,0	1,8	3,6	40
Italy	–	–	1,5	–	3,0	1,6	2,1	1,2	13
Spain	0,6	1,1	3,1	0,5	–	–	0,3	0,7	8
Netherlands	–	–	0,8	–	–	–	–	0,1	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	3,6	–	2,3	–	–	–	0,3	0,9	10
Austria, Finland, Sweden	1,8	–	1,5	–	–	–	3,9	1,6	18
Switzerland	0,6	–	–	0,5	–	–	–	0,2	2
other European countries ex CIS	0,6	–	0,8	–	1,5	–	–	0,3	3
Turkey	–	–	0,8	1,0	–	–	2,1	0,9	10
Russia	1,2	–	2,3	1,0	–	–	0,9	0,9	10
USA	3,6	2,3	1,5	28,0	–	–	0,3	6,2	69
Japan	2,4	–	–	1,0	–	–	–	0,5	6
Middle East	–	–	1,5	17,4	–	–	0,3	3,5	39
Rest of the world	1,8	–	5,4	3,9	–	2,4	2,1	2,5	28
N	169	88	130	207	67	124	335		1120
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 6.4b: Addressee scope by year

	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	20	1,7	2,1	1,9	4,3	2,9	33
other supranational	–	1,7	2,8	1,6	0,7	1,4	16
EU	–	16,8	30,1	33,7	37,1	31,5	353
other European supranational	–	1,7	1,4	0,5	0,2	0,7	8
multilateral	10	8,1	0,7	1,3	2,1	2,7	30
bilateral	–	0,6	0,7	0,3	0,2	0,4	4
Germany	–	1,7	1,4	4,0	1,7	2,4	27
France	–	31,8	37,1	42,3	29,9	34,9	391
UK	–	5,8	2,8	1,9	4,5	3,6	40
Italy	–	–	1,4	0,3	2,4	1,2	13
Spain	–	–	0,7	1,1	0,7	0,7	8
Netherlands	–	–	0,7	–	–	0,1	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	0,7	1,1	1,2	0,9	10
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	0,7	3,8	0,7	1,6	18
Switzerland	–	–	0,7	0,3	–	0,2	2
other European countries ex CIS	–	0,6	–	0,3	0,2	0,3	3
Turkey	–	–	2,1	0,5	1,2	0,9	10
Russia	–	1,7	1,4	0,3	1,0	0,9	10
USA	60	10,4	4,2	0,8	8,6	6,2	69
Japan	10	0,6	1,4	0,5	–	0,5	6
Middle East	–	12,7	2,1	1,6	1,9	3,5	39
Rest of the world	–	4,0	4,9	1,9	1,4	2,5	28
	10	173	144	371	421		1119
	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 6.4c: Addressee scope by broad addressee category

	<i>state and party</i>	<i>eco interest</i>	<i>media</i>	<i>other civil society</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
supranational: UN	3,3				2,9	33
other supranational	1,4			2,8	1,4	16
EU	34,9	2,7		1,4	31,6	354
other European supranational	0,7			1,4	0,7	8
multilateral	2,7	2,7		2,8	2,7	30
bilateral	0,4				0,4	4
Germany	2,6		100,0		2,4	27
France	31,3	89,2		58,3	34,9	391
UK	3,1	2,7		11,1	3,6	40
Italy	1,3				1,2	13
Spain	0,7			1,4	0,7	8
Netherlands	0,1				0,1	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	0,9			1,4	0,9	10
Austria, Finland, Sweden	1,5			4,2	1,6	18
Switzerland	0,2				0,2	2
other European countries ex CIS	0,3				0,3	3
Turkey	0,9			1,4	0,9	10
Russia	1,0				0,9	10
USA	6,7	2,7			6,2	69
Japan	0,6				0,5	6
Middle East	3,8			1,4	3,5	39
Rest of the world	1,9			12,5	2,5	28
	1010	37	1	72		1120
	100	100	100	100	100	

Issues and aims

Table 7.1: Issue field by year

	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
Monetary politics: currency and interest rate	16,7	10,7	26,4	16,2	15,8	16,7	237
Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control	–	5,4	2,8	14,5	4,8	8,2	116
Immigration: entry and exit	–	6,8	13,5	9,7	15,2	11,6	165
Troops deployment	83,3	39,5	14,6	7,6	17,2	17,1	243
Retirement and pension schemes	–	2,9	5,1	5,3	8,2	5,9	84
Education	–	13,2	10,1	12,4	9,0	11,0	156
European Integration	–	21,5	27,5	34,2	29,9	29,7	422
	12	205	178	526	501		1423
	100	100	100	100	100	100	

For each claim, the policy field and a more detailed sub-issue within this field are recorded, as well as the geographical scope of the issue (e.g. does it concern the French university system, a comparison between the French and the German systems, or a harmonisation of the national systems at European level?) as well as the general position the claim maker takes regarding European integration.

With a normal distribution, each policy field would make up 14% of the total database. In France, we found less clearly less claims on agriculture and pensions (8,2% and 5,9%, respectively) and more claims on European integration and troops deployment (29,7% and 17,1%).

The numbers of claims found in each policy field vary from one year to the other, and so does the distribution of cases across fields. In the following overview on each policy field, the thematic peaks of certain issues are explained.

Tables 7.2a-g: Issues within issue fields by year, in % within year

Table 7.2a: monetary policy

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
General Unspecific	9,1	–	2,4	–	1,7	4,0
Interest Rate Adjustments	45,5	44,7	25,9	8,9	26,6	63,0
EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	4,5	23,4	1,2	67,1	27,8	66,0
EMS/ERM	18,2	–	–	–	1,7	4
Exchange rate intervention	9,1	10,6	40,0	1,3	17,7	42,0
Independence Central Banks	9,1	–	3,5	–	2,1	5,0
Eurozone-outsiders: ERM2 & CC	–	–	3,5	3,8	2,5	6,0
Common currency (ECU, EURO)	4,5	21,3	10,6	13,9	13,5	32,0
Euro campaigns	–	–	–	3,8	1,3	3
Other Specific	–	–	12,9	1,3	5,1	12,0
N	24	47	87	79		237
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.2b: agriculture

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
Reform of the system of subsidies	36,4	80,0	3,9	29,2	15,5	18
subsidies and enlargement of the European Union	–	20,0	–	16,7	4,3	5
subsidies and international trade	54,5	–	3,9	16,7	11,2	13
BSE	9,1	–	88,2	25,0	63,8	74
Foot and Mouth Disease	–	–	1,3	4,2	1,7	2
other diseases	–	–	2,6	8,3	3,4	4
N	11	5	76	24		116
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.2c: immigration

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
General evaluation or policy direction	28,6	8,3	7,8	18,4	14,5	24
institutional framework, responsibilities, ...	7,1	8,3	2,0	2,6	3,6	6
entry and border controls	14,3	20,8	35,3	13,2	21,2	35
expulsions/deportations	21,4	45,8	25,5	31,6	30,9	51
migration programs and quotas	–	–	9,8	1,3	3,6	6
3rd parties in preventing migration	–	–	–	3,9	1,8	3
visa and consular policy	14,3	8,3	9,8	14,5	12,1	20
actions relating to smuggling and illegal entries	7,1	8,3	5,9	14,5	10,3	17
other specific issues	7,1	–	3,9	–	1,8	3
N	14	24	51	76		165
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.2d: troops deployment

	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
General unspecific reference to deployment of troops	–	2,5	3,8	7,5	3,5	3,7	9
d.o.t for mil. aggression on foreign sovereign territory	–	40,7	23,1	2,5	24,4	25,1	61
d.o.t for mil. invasion of foreign sovereign territory	–	23,5	15,4	5,0	7,0	12,8	31
d.o.t in covert aggr. operations vs hostile regimes/groups	10,0	13,6	3,8	17,5	43,0	27,2	66
d.o.t for peace-keeping	–	2,5	26,9	32,5	14,0	14,0	34
d.o.t to rescue/protect civilians facing aggression	–	2,5	7,7	20,0	–	4,9	12
d.o.t in crisis, civil emergency, catastrophic events	–	1,2	3,8	–	1,2	1,2	3
d.o.t in the context of military alliances	–	–	–	–	1,2	0,4	1
other specific reference to deployment of troops	–	13,6	15,4	15,0	5,8	10,7	26
N		10	81	26	40	86	243
%		100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.2e: pensions

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
General	1,0	11,1	14,3	22,0	17,9	15
Demographic changes: ageing population	–	11,1	3,6	7,3	6,0	5
Retirement ages	2,0	22,2	–	24,4	16,7	14
Income levels in retirement, Poverty in retirement	3,0	22,2	17,9	4,9	14,3	12
State versus private pension schemes	–	33,3	21,4	7,3	14,3	12
State pension scheme	–	–	35,7	22,0	22,6	19
Private pension scheme	–	–	7,1	2,4	3,6	3
Other / Specific	–	–	–	9,8	4,8	4
N	6	9	28	41		84
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.2f: education

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
General unspecific	7,4	5,6	7,7	11,1	8,3	13
Structural issues	7,4	16,7	10,8	17,8	12,8	20
Resource allocation and salaries	18,5	22,2	18,5	13,3	17,3	27
Private education	–	–	3,1	–	1,3	2
Administrative power allocation	7,4	–	1,5	4,4	3,2	5
Curriculum	7,4	22,2	12,3	6,7	10,9	17
Information and communication technologies	–	–	3,1	–	1,3	2
Problems at school	48,1	22,2	30,8	42,2	35,9	56
other specific issues	3,7	11,1	12,3	4,4	9,0	14
N	27	19	65	45		156
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.2g: European integration

	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
EMU Convergence criteria and stability pact	–	–	–	1,3	0,5	2
General European integration, not specific	4,5	18,4	3,4	7,3	6,6	28
National vs. European Identity, shared values	2,3	–	1,7	2,0	1,7	7
Role of a specific country and balance of power in the EU	15,9	6,1	27,9	12,0	18,5	78
Relationship EU - nat.®. levels / future constitution	25,0	12,2	34,6	26,0	28,0	118
Institutional structure & relationship between EU instit.	6,8	14,3	10,1	13,3	11,4	48
Defining EU's core tasks/balance of different policy areas	4,5	6,1	1,7	1,3	2,4	10
Relationship between EU institutions and public	–	–	2,2	0,7	1,2	5
Enlargement	15,9	12,2	15,1	32,7	21,1	89
Budget: Financing the EU and spending EU funds	2,3	2,0	–	0,7	0,7	3
other specific EU integration	2,3	–	2,8	–	1,4	6
Associational agreements/ treaties EU - non-EU countries	9,1	16,3	0,6	–	3,1	13
Personnel issues within EU/discussions about candidacies	–	4,1	–	2,7	1,4	6
Non-EU forms of European integration	11,4	8,2	–	–	2,1	9
N	44	49	179	150		422
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.3a: Issue scope by issue field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
supranational: UN	0,4	–	–	17,4	–	–	–	3,0	43
other supranational	0,4	3,4	–	4,1	–	–	0,2	1,1	16
EU	70,5	29,3	19,5	1,7	1,2	–	96,0	45,4	644
other European supranational	0,4	–	0,6	–	–	–	2,8	1,0	14
multilateral	2,5	6,0	3,0	12,9	1,2	–	–	3,5	50
bilateral	–	3,4	14,0	53,9	–	–	0,2	11,1	158
Germany	2,1	2,6	2,4	–	1,2	–	–	0,9	13
France	6,8	50,0	42,7	0,8	91,7	93,5	0,2	26,0	369
Uk	1,3	2,6	6,1	0,4	–	3,2	0,2	1,6	23
Italy	0,8	–	1,2	–	2,4	1,3	–	0,6	8
Spain	0,4	0,9	3,0	–	–	–	–	0,5	7
Netherlands	0,4	–	–	–	–	–	–	0,1	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	0,4	–	0,6	–	–	–	–	0,1	2
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	1,2	–	–	–	0,2	0,2	3
Switzerland	0,4	–	0,6	–	–	–	–	0,1	2
other European countries ex CIS	–	–	–	1,2	1,2	–	–	0,3	4
Turkey	–	–	–	0,4	–	–	–	0,1	1
Russia	0,8	–	0,6	0,4	1,2	–	–	0,4	5
USA	8,0	–	1,2	2,9	–	–	–	2,0	28
Japan	3,0	0,9	–	–	–	–	–	0,6	8
Middle East	–	–	1,2	2,5	–	–	–	0,6	8
Rest of the world	1,3	0,9	1,8	1,2	–	1,9	–	0,9	13
	237	116	164	241	84	155	423		1420
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.3b: Issue scope by year

	% per year					Total	
	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	–	1,46	1,69	1,72	5,63	3,03	43
other supranational	–	1,95	1,69	0,95	0,80	1,13	16
EU	–	25,85	42,70	49,05	51,51	45,31	643
other European supranational	–	2,44	2,25	0,76	0,20	0,99	14
multilateral	–	8,78	2,81	2,29	3,02	3,52	50
bilateral	83,33	28,29	12,36	4,20	9,26	11,13	158
Germany	–	0,49	1,12	1,34	0,60	0,92	13
France	–	19,51	26,40	31,11	23,94	26,00	369
Uk	–	4,39	1,12	1,34	1,01	1,62	23
Italy	–	0,49	1,12	0,19	0,80	0,56	8
Spain	–	–	0,56	0,95	0,20	0,49	7
Netherlands	8,33	–	–	–	–	0,07	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	–	0,19	0,20	0,14	2
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	–	0,38	0,20	0,21	3
Switzerland	–	–	0,56	0,19	–	0,14	2
other European countries ex CIS	–	–	–	0,76	–	0,28	4
Turkey	–	0,49	–	–	–	0,07	1
Russia	–	0,98	0,56	0,38	–	0,35	5
USA	–	2,44	2,25	1,53	2,21	1,97	28
Japan	8,33	–	0,56	0,95	–	0,56	8
Middle East	–	0,98	–	1,15	–	0,56	8
Rest of the world	–	1,46	2,25	0,57	0,40	0,92	13
N	12	205	179	526	497		1419
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 7.4a-g: Issue scope by year, separate for each policy field

7.4a: monetary policy

SCOPE	as % in year				Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	–	2,13	–	–	0,42	1
other supranational	–	–	–	1,27	0,42	1
EU	36,36	44,68	76,47	91,14	70,46	167
other European supranational	–	–	–	1,27	0,42	1
multilateral	4,55	–	5,88	–	2,53	6
germany	4,55	4,26	2,35	–	2,11	5
france	18,18	23,40	1,18	–	6,75	16
uk	4,55	4,26	–	–	1,27	3
italy	4,55	2,13	–	–	0,84	2
spain	–	2,13	–	–	0,42	1
netherlands	–	–	–	–	0,42	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	1,18	–	0,42	1
Switzerland	–	2,13	–	–	0,42	1
russia	4,55	2,13	–	–	0,84	2
USA	18,18	8,51	8,24	5,06	8,02	19
Japan	–	2,13	4,71	–	2,95	7
Rest of the world	4,55	2,13	–	1,27	1,27	3
N	24	47	87	79		239
%	100	100	100	100	100	

7.4b: agricultural policy

SCOPE	% in year				Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
other supranational	36,4	–	–	–	3,4	4
EU	27,3	100,0	17,1	54,2	29,3	34
multilateral	–	–	5,3	12,5	6,0	7
bilateral	–	–	3,9	4,2	3,4	4
Germany	–	–	3,9	–	2,6	3
France	27,3	–	63,2	29,2	50,0	58
UK	9,1	–	2,6	–	2,6	3
Spain	–	–	1,3	–	0,9	1
Japan	–	–	1,3	–	0,9	1
Rest of the world	–	–	1,3	–	0,9	1
N	11	5	76	24		116
%	100	100	100	100	100	

7.4c: immigration policy

	Total					N
	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	
EU	28,57	20,83	5,88	26,67	19,51	32
other European supranational	–	–	1,96	–	0,61	1
multilateral	–	–	3,92	4,00	3,05	5
bilateral	14,29	25,00	13,73	10,67	14,02	23
Germany	–	–	1,96	4,00	2,44	4
France	28,57	50,00	43,14	42,67	42,68	70
UK	14,29	–	7,84	5,33	6,10	10
Italy	–	–	1,96	1,33	1,22	2
Spain	–	–	7,84	1,33	3,05	5
other pre-1995 EU-members	–	–	–	1,33	0,61	1
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	1,96	1,33	1,22	2
Switzerland	–	–	1,96	–	0,61	1
Russia	–	–	1,96	–	0,61	1
USA	7,14	–	1,96	–	1,22	2
Middle East	–	–	3,92	–	1,22	2
Rest of the world	7,14	4,17	–	1,33	1,83	3
N	14	24	51	75		164
%	100	100	100	100	100	

7.4d: troops deployment

	YEAR					Total	
	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	–	3,7	7,7	22,5	33,3	17,4	42
other supranational	–	–	11,5	12,5	2,4	4,1	10
EU	–	–	–	7,5	1,2	1,7	4
multilateral	–	21,0	19,2	2,5	9,5	12,9	31
bilateral	100,0	69,1	61,5	27,5	44,0	53,9	130
France	–	–	–	5,0	–	0,8	2
UK	–	–	–	–	1,2	0,4	1
other European countries ex CIS	–	–	–	7,5	–	1,2	3
Turkey	–	1,2	–	–	–	0,4	1
Russia	–	1,2	–	–	–	0,4	1
USA	–	–	–	–	8,3	2,9	7
Middle East	–	2,5	–	10,0	–	2,5	6
Rest of the world	–	1,2	–	5,0	–	1,2	3
N	10	81	26	40	84		241
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	

7.4e: pensions

	% in year				Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
EU	–	–	–	2,4	1,2	1
multilateral	–	–	–	2,4	1,2	1
Germany	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
France	100,0	88,9	89,3	92,7	91,7	77
Italy	–	11,1	–	2,4	2,4	2
other European countries ex CIS	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
Russia	–	–	3,6	–	1,2	1
N		6	9	28	41	84
%	100	100	100	100	100	

7.4f: education policy

	% in year				Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
France	81,5	88,9	100,0	95,5	93,5	145
UK	18,5	–	–	–	3,2	5
Italy	–	–	–	4,5	1,3	2
Rest of the world	–	11,1	–	–	1,9	3
N	27	18	65	44		154
%	100	100	100	100	100	

7.4g: European integration

	% in year				Total	
	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
other supranational	–	–	–	0,67	0,24	1
EU	86,36	91,84	96,65	99,33	95,97	405
other European supranational	11,36	8,16	1,68	–	2,84	12
bilateral	–	–	0,56	–	0,24	1
France	2,27	–	–	–	0,24	1
UK	–	–	0,56	–	0,24	1
Austria, Finland, Sweden	–	–	0,56	–	0,24	1
N	44	49	179	150		422
%	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 8.1: Position regarding European integration by policy field and year

<i>Issue field</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
Monetary politics: currency and interest rate	1990	0,43	21	0,87
	1995	0,56	64	0,66
	2000	0,20	141	0,59
	2001	0,21	121	0,67
	2002	0,24	113	0,75
	Total	0,28	460	0,69
Agriculture: Subs., livest. quotas, disease control	1990	0,22	9	0,83
	1995	0,00	5	0,71
	2000	0,44	57	0,68
	2001	0,21	61	0,71
	2002	0,14	42	0,61
	Total	0,26	174	0,69
Immigration: entry and exit	1990	0,43	7	0,53
	1995	0,50	10	0,71
	2000	0,60	10	0,70
	2001	1,00	6	0,00
	2002	0,33	33	0,82
	Total	0,47	66	0,73
Troops deployment	1990	1,00	1	
	1995	0,50	2	0,71
	2000	0,38	16	0,81
	2001	-0,27	11	1,01
	2002	0,25	8	0,89
	Total	0,18	38	0,90
Retirement and pension schemes	2000	0,00	1	
	2002	0,00	1	
	Total	0,00	2	0,00
Education	1990	1,00	1	
	2002	0,00	1	
	Total	0,50	2	0,71
European Integration	1990	0,52	82	0,76
	1995	0,53	93	0,72
	2000	0,32	408	0,74
	2001	0,39	155	0,79
	2002	0,37	280	0,78
	Total	0,38	1018	0,76
Total	1990	0,49	121	0,77
	1995	0,52	174	0,69
	2000	0,31	633	0,71
	2001	0,29	354	0,75
	2002	0,31	478	0,76
	Total	0,34	1760	0,74

Table 8.2: Position regarding European integration by actor type

<i>actor type</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
state and party actors	0,38	1387	0,72
economic interest groups	0,14	134	0,78
media and journalists	0,23	136	0,77
other civil society actors	0,18	92	0,84
general/unknown/unspecified	0,14	14	0,86
politicians	0,07	110	0,86
former states(wo)men	0,55	38	0,69
government/executive	0,48	880	0,67
legislative	0,32	148	0,76
judiciary	0,38	8	0,52
police and internal security agencies	0,50	2	0,71
military	0,00	2	0,00
central banks	0,25	101	0,54
other state executive agencies	0,33	18	0,59
political parties	-0,03	80	0,89
unions and employees	0,23	22	0,81
employers organisations and firms	0,22	23	0,80
churches and religious organisations and groups	0,11	9	0,60
media and journalists	0,23	136	0,77
farmers and agricultural organisations	0,07	28	0,81
educational professionals and organisations	1,00	1	
economists and financial experts	0,11	61	0,75
other scientific and research professionals and institutions	0,45	38	0,80
students, pupils, and their parents	1,00	1	
other professional organisations and groups	-1,00	1	
consumer organisations and groups	0,20	5	0,84
migrant organisations and groups	1,00	1,	
pro- and anti-European campaign organisations&groups	-0,11	18	0,96
solidarity and human rights organisations	0,40	5	0,55
other civil society organisations and groups	-0,31	13	0,75
the general public	-0,20	5	1,10
unknown/unspecified actors	0,38	8	0,74
Total	0,34	1763	0,74

Table 8.3: Position regarding European integration by actor scope

<i>actor scope</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
Supranational: UN	0,50	2	0,71
Other supranational	-0,13	8	0,83
EU	0,43	569	0,65
Other European supranational	0,50	6	0,55
Multilateral	0,00	2	1,41
Bilateral	1,00	2	0,00
Germany	0,38	139	0,66
France	0,31	658	0,78
UK	-0,07	70	0,82
Italy	0,31	35	0,80
Spain	0,61	18	0,50
Netherlands	0,60	5	0,55
Other pre-1995 EU-members	0,33	61	0,79
Austria, Finland, Sweden	0,16	56	0,73
Switzerland	1,00	3	0,00
Other European countries ex CIS	0,73	11	0,47
Turkey	0,06	17	0,90
Russia	-0,14	7	0,90
USA	-0,07	14	0,92
Rest of the world	0,43	65	0,77
Total	0,34	1748	0,74

Table 8.4: Position regarding European integration by party affiliation and by year

<i>PARTY</i>	<i>YEAR</i>	<i>POSITION</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>STD DEV</i>
Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire (LCR)	2000	1,00	1,	
	Total	1,00	1,	
Lutte ouvriere (Arlette Laguiller) (LO)	1995	-0,50	2	0,71
	2002	1,00	1,	
	Total	0,00	3	1,00
Parti communiste francais	1995	0,00	2	1,41
	2000	0,11	9	0,93
	2001	-1,00	1,	
	2002	0,00	5	0,71
	Total	0,00	17	0,87
Parti socialiste	1990	0,43	21	0,81
	1995	0,82	11	0,40
	2000	0,49	69	0,61
	2001	0,50	40	0,64
	2002	0,45	20	0,76
	Total	0,50	161	0,65
Parti radical de gauche	1990	1,00	1,	
	1995	1,00	1,	
	Total	1,00	2	0,00
Les Verts	1995	1,00	1,	
	2000	0,60	5	0,89
	2001	-0,33	3	1,15
	2002	0,00	2	1,41
	Total	0,27	11	1,01
Mouvement des Citoyens	2000	-0,60	5	0,89
	2001	-1,00	2	0,00
	2002	0,00	1,	
	Total	-0,63	8	0,74
gauche plurielle' (coalition 1997-2001)	2000	0,20	5	0,45
	2001	0,25	4	0,96
	Total	0,22	9	0,67
Rassemblement pour la Republique	1990	0,14	14	1,03
	1995	0,65	23	0,57
	2000	0,71	31	0,53
	2001	0,92	13	0,28
	2002	0,53	30	0,68
	Total	0,60	111	0,66
Union pour la democratie francaise (UDF)	1990	1,00	9	0,00
	1995	0,80	5	0,45
	2000	0,31	13	0,75
	2001	0,17	12	0,94
	2002	0,56	16	0,73
	Total	0,51	55	0,74
Democratie liberale	1995	1,00	1,	
	2000	1,00	1,	
	2001	-0,50	2	0,71

	2002	0,57	7	0,53
	Total	0,45	11	0,69
right-wing coalition (different names)	1990	1,00	1,	
	1995	0,50	2	0,71
	2002	0,50	4	1,00
	Total	0,57	7	0,79
Mouvement pour la France	1995	-0,80	5	0,45
	2000	-1,00	1,	
	2001	-1,00	1,	
	2002	0,00	5	1,00
	Total	-0,50	12	0,80
(RPF)	2000	-1,00	3	0,00
	2001	-1,00	5	0,00
	2002	-1,00	2	0,00
	Total	-1,00	10	0,00
Front national	2000	-1,00	3	0,00
	2002	-1,00	5	0,00
	Total	-1,00	8	0,00
Mouvement national republicain	2002	0,00	1,	
	Total	0,00	1,	
Other (FR)	1990	1,00	2	0,00
	2001	-1,00	1,	
	Total	0,33	3	1,15

Object actors

Table 9.1: Presence of object actor by policy field

	Issue Field							All	
	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	%	N
No	22,4	12,9	8,5	7,0	8,3	7,7	16,8	13,3	189
Yes	77,6	87,1	91,5	93,0	91,7	92,3	83,2	86,7	1235
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
N	237	116	165	243	84	156	423		1424

Table 9.2a: Object actor type by policy field

In detail

	<i>Issue Field</i>							<i>All</i>	
	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
whole polities	24,5	4,0	2,6	42,9-	-	-	46,0	25,3	312
politicians	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,3	0,1	1
government/executive	16,3	3,0	5,3	25,7-	-	2,1	39,8	19,6	242
legislative	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,1	1,5	18
judiciary	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,3	0,1	1
military	-	-	-	22,6	1,3-	-	0,6	4,4	54
central banks	3,8-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,6	7
social security executive organisations	-	-	-	-	1,3-	-	-	0,1	1
other state executive agencies	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,3	0,1	1
political parties	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,3	0,1	1
unions and employees	2,7-	-	-	-	48,1-	-	1,1	3,7	46
employers organisations and firms	7,1-	-	-	-	1,3-	-	0,6	1,3	16
churches and religious groups	0,5-	-	-	-	-	-	0,3	0,2	2
farmers and agricultural organisations	-	54,5-	-	-	1,3-	-	0,3	4,6	57
educational professionals	-	-	-	-	-	35,4-	-	4,1	51
students, pupils, and their parents	-	3,0-	-	-	-	60,4-	-	7,3	90
consumer organisations and groups	-	21,8-	-	-	-	-	-	1,8	22
migrant organisations and groups	-	-	86,8	1,8-	-	1,4-	-	11,1	137
welfare organisations	-	-	-	-	1,3-	-	-	0,1	1
racist and extreme right groups	-	-	-	-	-	0,7-	-	0,1	1
organisations and groups of the elderly	-	-	-	-	40,3-	-	-	2,5	31
terrorist groups	-	-	-	1,8-	-	-	-	0,3	4
rebel forces/guerilla	-	-	-	2,2-	-	-	-	0,4	5
other civil society organisations	0,5	1,0-	-	0,4	2,6-	-	0,9	0,6	8
whole economies	42,4	4,0-	-	0,9-	-	-	1,4	7,2	89
the general public	2,2	8,9	5,3	1,8	2,6-	-	2,8	3,0	37
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	184	101	151	226	77	144	352		1235

Broad categories

	<i>Issue field</i>							<i>All</i>	
	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
state and party actors	20,1	3,0	5,3	48,2	2,6	2,1	46,6	26,4	326
economic interest groups	9,8	54,5	-	-	50,6	-	2,0	9,6	119
other civil society actors	1,1	25,7	86,8	6,2	44,2	97,9	1,1	28,5	352
general/unknown/unspecified	69,0	16,8	7,9	45,6	2,6	-	50,3	35,5	438
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
N	184	101	151	226	77	144	352		1235

Table 9.2b: Object actor type by year

In Detail

	Year					All	
	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
whole polities	50,0	30,5	24,8	17,8	29,6	25,3	312
politicians	-	-	0,6	-	-	0,1	1
government/executive	25,0	19,8	10,9	19,0	22,9	19,5	241
legislative	-	0,5	-	1,0	2,8	1,5	18
judiciary	-	-	-	0,2	-	0,1	1
military	-	9,6	7,3	3,0	2,6	4,4	54
central banks	-	1,1	-	1,2	-	0,6	7
social security executive organisations	-	-	-	-	0,2	0,1	1
other state executive agencies	-	-	-	-	0,2	0,1	1
political parties	-	-	-	0,2	-	0,1	1
unions and employees	-	2,1	4,8	2,7	4,9	3,7	46
employers organisations and firms	-	1,1	-	2,7	0,4	1,3	16
churches and religious organisations and groups	-	-	-	-	0,4	0,2	2
farmers and agricultural organisations	-	4,8	3,6	6,9	3,0	4,6	57
educational professionals and organisations	-	1,1	2,4	5,7	4,7	4,1	51
students, pupils, and their parents	-	11,2	7,9	8,9	4,1	7,3	90
consumer organisations and groups	-	0,5	-	4,4	0,6	1,8	22
migrant organisations and groups	-	7,0	10,9	11,6	12,6	11,1	137
welfare organisations	-	-	-	0,2	-	0,1	1
racist and extreme right organisations and groups	-	-	-	0,2	-	0,1	1
organisations and groups of the elderly	-	1,6	1,8	2,7	3,0	2,5	31
terrorist groups	-	-	1,2	0,5	-	0,3	4
rebel forces/guerilla	-	1,1	-	0,2	0,4	0,4	5
other civil society organisations and groups	-	-	0,6	1,5	0,2	0,6	8
whole economies	25,0	6,4	20,6	4,0	5,4	7,2	89
the general public	-	1,6	2,4	5,2	1,9	3,0	37
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	
N	8	187	166	406	467		1234

Broad Categories

	Year					All	
	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
state and party actors	25,0	31,0	18,8	24,7	28,7	26,3	325
economic interest groups	-	8,0	8,5	12,3	8,4	9,6	119
other civil society actors	-	22,5	24,8	36,0	26,1	28,5	352
general/unknown/unspecified	75,0	38,5	47,9	26,9	36,8	35,5	438
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	8	187	166	406	467		1234

Table 9.3a: Evaluation by object actor type

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Standard-deviation</i>
state and party actors	0,09	326	0,88
economic interest groups	0,29	119	0,76
other civil society actors	0,35	352	0,85
general/unknown/unspecified	0,51	438	0,76
military	0,46	54	0,75
central banks	0,29	7	0,95
social security executive organisations	1,00	1	
other state executive agencies	1,00	1	
political parties	0,00	1	
unions and employees	0,52	46	0,69
employers organisations and firms	0,13	16	0,50
churches and religious organisations and groups	1,00	2	0,00
farmers and agricultural organisations	0,16	57	0,84
educational professionals and organisations	0,71	51	0,64
students, pupils, and their parents	0,58	90	0,67
consumer organisations and groups	0,82	22	0,50
migrant organisations and groups	-0,04	137	0,95
welfare organisations	0,00	1	
racist and extreme right organisations and groups	1,00	1	
organisations and groups of the elderly	0,55	31	0,72
terrorist groups	0,00	4	1,15
rebel forces/guerilla	0,00	5	1,00
other civil society organisations and groups	0,375	8	0,74
whole economies	0,61	89	0,68
the general public	0,76	37	0,49
Total	0,33	1235	0,84

Table 9.3b: Evaluation by object actor scope

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Standard-deviation</i>
supranational: UN	0,41	17	0,71
other supranational	0,38	8	0,92
EU	0,41	346	0,79
other European supranational	0,50	2	0,71
multilateral	-0,15	59	0,87
bilateral	1,00	1-	
Germany	0,45	22	0,80
France	0,50	366	0,75
UK	0,41	27	0,84
Italy	0,42	12	0,90
Spain	0,13	8	0,99
Netherlands	1,00	1-	
other pre-1995 EU-members	-0,20	10	0,92
Austria, Finland, Sweden	-0,16	37	0,93
Switzerland	1,00	2	0,00
other European countries ex CIS	0,77	22	0,61
Turkey	0,25	20	0,97
Russia	0,33	21	0,86
USA	0,03	33	0,95
Japan	0,75	12	0,45
Middle East	0,02	118	0,92
Rest of the world	0,29	72	0,86
Total	0,34	1216	0,84

Table 9.4a: Object actor scope by policy field

	<i>Issue field</i>							<i>All</i>	
	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
supranational: UN	-	-	-	7,5-	-	-	-	1,4	17
other supranational	0,6-	-	0,7	2,7-	-	-	-	0,7	8
EU	42,2	20,8	4,9	2,2-	-	-	68,2	28,5	346
other European supranational	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,6	0,2	2
multilateral	3,5	5,9	22,9	4,9	1,3	0,7	0,3	4,9	59
bilateral	-	-	0,7-	-	-	-	-	0,1	1
germany	5,2	2,0	1,4-	-	-	-	2,6	1,8	22
france	22,0	57,4	29,2	2,7	93,5	92,3	5,1	30,1	366
uk	3,5	4,0	1,4	2,2-	-	3,5	1,4	2,2	27
italy	0,6-	-	0,7-	-	2,6	1,4	1,7	1,0	12
spain	1,2	1,0	2,8	0,4-	-	-	-	0,7	8
netherlands	0,6-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,1	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	5,2-	-	0,7-	-	-	-	-	0,8	10
austria, finland, sweden	2,3-	-	0,7-	-	-	-	9,1	3,0	37
Switzerland	0,6-	-	-	0,4-	-	-	-	0,2	2
other european countries ex CIS	0,6-	-	4,9	3,1	1,3-	-	1,7	1,8	22
turkey	-	-	1,4-	-	-	-	5,1	1,6	20
russia	1,2	1,0	5,6	2,2	1,3-	-	1,1	1,7	21
USA	5,2	1,0-	-	10,2-	-	-	-	2,7	33
Japan	4,6	2,0-	-	0,9-	-	-	-	1,0	12
Middle East	-	-	4,9	48,7-	-	-	0,3	9,7	118
Rest of the world	1,2	5,0	17,4	11,9-	-	2,1	2,8	5,9	72
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	173	101	144	226	77	143	352		1216

Table 9.4b: Object actor scope by year

	<i>Year</i>					<i>All</i>	
	1989	1990	1995	2000	2002	%	N
supranational: UN	-	0,5	1,8	1,3	1,7	1,4	17
other supranational	-	-	1,2	1,0	0,4	0,7	8
EU	-	16,7	31,3	28,7	32,5	28,4	345
other European supranational	-	0,5-	-	0,3-	-	0,2	2
multilateral	-	9,7	6,1	2,5	4,5	4,9	59
bilateral	-	-	-	0,3-	-	0,1	1
Germany	-	4,3	2,5	0,3	1,9	1,8	22
France	-	20,4	28,8	37,6	28,8	30,1	366
UK	-	4,3	1,8	2,3	1,5	2,2	27
Italy	-	-	1,2	0,3	1,9	1,0	12
Spain	-	-	0,6	1,5	0,2	0,7	8
Netherlands	12,5-	-	-	-	-	0,1	1
other pre-1995 EU-members	-	-	-	1,5	0,9	0,8	10
Austria, Finland, Sweden	-	-	1,2	8,1	0,6	3,0	37
Switzerland	-	-	0,6	0,3-	-	0,2	2
other European countries ex CIS	-	1,1	4,9	2,0	0,9	1,8	22
Turkey	-	-	1,2-	-	3,9	1,6	20
Russia	-	3,2	1,2	1,0	1,9	1,7	21
USA	25,0	5,4	2,5	0,3	3,5	2,7	33
Japan	12,5	0,5	1,8	1,5-	-	1,0	12
Middle East	-	25,3	2,5	5,1	10,2	9,7	118
Rest of the world	50,0	8,1	8,6	4,3	4,5	5,9	72
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	
N	8	186	164	395	462		1215

Frames

Table 10.1a: Presence of frames by policy sector

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>PEN</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
NO	64,2	78,2	77,6	59,0	100,0		51,9	58,9	1044
YES	35,8	21,8	22,4	41,0		100,0	48,1	41,1	730
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
N	464	174	67	39	2	2	1026		1774

Over a third of all claims dealing with a European issue contain a frame related to European integration. Frames are defined as the justification of a claim. It answers the question “why is the claim made or why should it be implemented?”. The codebook lists four types of frames: identity frames (what the EU is or stands for), instrumental frames (what EU integration is good for), historical frames (justification of EU because of an historical experience), and frames internal to the integration process (causal linkages between different aspects of EU integration, for instance ‘enlargement requires institutional reform’). Claims in debates about “European integration” use frames more often (48,1%) than in sectoral policy fields. We should remember that most claims are verbal statements. They lend themselves more to mentioning explicitly the “why” of the claim if it is included in a quote in an article than other forms of claims (protest, etc.) where the journalist may not always report on the justification of the action. Monetary policy is the policy field with most frames compared to other sectors.

Table 10.1b: Presence of frames by broad actor type

	state	eco interests	media	civil soc	unknown	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
NO	62,5		53,3	41,6	33,7	85,7	58,9 1044
YES	37,5		46,7	58,4	66,3	14,3	41,1 730
%	100		100	100	100	100	100
N	1396		135	137	92	14	1784

There is an overwhelming presence of state and party actors in claims with a European dimension and therefore the presence of frames in claims by this category of actors is close to the mean (37,5%). In the remaining claims, we notice that in all other categories there is a more frequent use of frames, especially for media of journalists and civil society actors.

Table 10.2a: Frame type by policy field

	<i>MON</i>	<i>AGRI</i>	<i>IMM</i>	<i>TRP</i>	<i>EDU</i>	<i>EUI</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
identity, normative and value frames	13,3	13,2	26,7	12,5	50,0	31,0	25,6	187
constitutional and governance frames	13,3	10,5	40,0	18,8		28,4	24,0	175
economic frames	54,2	39,5	6,7			5,5	18,2	133
other instrumental frames	10,8	28,9	26,7	62,5	50,0	11,4	13,7	100
historical frames	4,2	2,6		6,3		9,9	7,9	58
frames internal to the integration process	4,2	5,3				13,8	10,5	77
N	166	38	15	16	2	493		730
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 10.2b: Frame type by year

	<i>1990</i>	<i>1995</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>
identity, normative and value frames	22,7	26,7	24,8	12,5	33,8	25,7	187
constitutional and governance frames	27,3	26,7	22,8	20,8	25,5	24,0	175
economic frames	7,6	25,0	23,5	17,7	11,8	18,2	133
other instrumental frames	15,2	10,0	10,3	32,3	10,8	13,7	100
historical frames	16,7	5,0	6,0	7,3	8,8	7,8	57
frames internal to the integration process	10,6	6,7	12,6	9,4	9,3	10,6	77
N	66	60	303	96	204		729
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Table 10.3: Twenty-five most often mentioned frames

<i>frames</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
institutional reforms > enlargement	47	6,4
federalism	36	4,9
community of values	31	4,2
democracy	31	4,2
economic growth	31	4,2
sovereignty	23	3,2
acceptance of the EU by citizens	23	3,2
inflation	23	3,2
efficiency, competence	21	2,9
European - a countrys relation with USA	20	2,7
equality among countries/member states/regions	18	2,5
national identity	17	2,3
national interest	17	2,3
influence/weight in international relations	16	2,2
Christianity/(judeo-)christian values	14	1,9
(social) justice	14	1,9
French-German co-operation in the postwar period	13	1,8
human rights	12	1,6
strength in global competition	12	1,6
rule of law	11	1,5
history of the EU//founding fathers and principles	11	1,5
free trade	10	1,4
economic stability	10	1,4
racism/xenophobia	9	1,2
security	9	1,2
unemployment	9	1,2
consumer protection	9	1,2
other	9	1,2

Abbreviations and definitions

Data

.	Not applicable
–	Nil
0	Less than half the final digit shown

Newspapers

Figaro	Le Figaro
Monde	Le Monde
OF	Ouest France
Huma	l'Humanité

Issue fields

MON	Monetary politics: currency and interest rate
AGR	Agriculture: Subsidies, livestock quotas, disease control
IMM	Immigration: entry and exit
TRP	Troop deployment
PEN	Retirement and pension schemes
EDU	Education
EUI	European Integration

Miscellaneous

10 upcoming enlarg. c.:	New EU Member States as from 1.5.2004 (Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia)
AFP	Agence France Presse
AP	Associated Press
BSE	Bovine spongiform encephalopathy
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States (Russia and the former Soviet republics, excluding the three Baltic countries)
ECB	European Central Bank
EMU	European Monetary Union
ETUC	European Trade Union Confederation
EU	the European Union
EU seat	European Union seat (Brussels, Luxembourg, Strasbourg, Frankfurt, etc.)
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
Middle East	defined here as: Israel, Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Iran, Afghanistan, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman, Yemen
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
PES	Party of European Socialists
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UN	United Nations
UNICE	Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations of Europe
USA	United States of America
WTO	World Trade Organisation

References

Olivier Baisnée (2003) « une actualité invendable : les rédactions française et britannique face à l'actualité communautaire » in Garcia and Le Torrec.

Olivier Baisnée (2004) « Le corps de presse accrédité auprès de l'Union européenne. Une comparaison franco-britannique » in Marchetti.

Gilles Bastin (2003) « L'Europe saisie par l'information (1952-12001) : des professionnels du journalisme engagé aux content coordinators » in Garcia and Le Torrec.

Guillaume Garcia and Virginie Le Torrec (2003) *Regards croisés sur l'information européenne. Cahiers Politiques*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Virginie Guiraudon (2000) *Sociologie de l'Europe. Mobilisations, élites et configurations institutionnelles. Culture et conflits* 38/39. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Virginie Guiraudon (2001) "Weak Weapons of the Weak? Mobilizing around Migration at the EU-level" in Imig and Tarrow (eds).

Doug Imig and Sid Tarrow (eds) (2001) *Contentious Europeans: Protest and Politics in an Emerging Polity*. New York : Rowman and Littlefield.

Jean Joana and Andy Smith (2002) *Les commissaires européens. Technocrates, diplomates ou politiques?* Paris : Presses de sciences-po.

Dominique Marchetti (2004) *En quête d'Europe. Médias européens et médiatisation de l'Europe*. Rennes : PUR.